



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/019,343	05/20/2002	Takao Yoshimine	450101-03178	8796	
22850	7590 09/08/2000		EXAMINER		
C. IRVIN MCCLELLAND			CHEA, PHILIP J		
•	OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ALEXAND	IA, VA 22314		2153		
		DATE MAILED: 09/08/2006			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action						
Before the Fil	ing of an	Appeal	Brief			

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/019,343	YOSHIMINE, TAKAO		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Philip J. Chea	2153		

·	Philip J. Chea	2153					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	lress				
THE REPLY FILED 11 August 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have leen filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) bove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any arreed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be AMENDMENTS	extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal	of the appeal.				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brie	f will not be entered	hecause				
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be	onsideration and/or search (see NO ow);	TE below);					
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally re	ejected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a))							
The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling							
the non-allowable claim(s).	monable ii dabiiiiiida iii a deparate	,	.				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	☑ will not be entered, or b) ☐ wovided below or appended.	vill be entered and an	explanation of				
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>8-14</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	ut before or on the date of filing a land sufficient reasons why the affida	Notice of Appeal will vit or other evidence	not be entered is necessary				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessa	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	eal and/or appellant fa	ails to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
 The request for reconsideration has been considered be <u>Please see attached.</u> 	ut does NOT place the application i	in condition for allow	ance because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)							



Application/Control Number: 10/019,343

Art Unit: 2153

Response to Arguments

(A) Applicant contends that Barraclough in view of Bandaru does not teach having data transmitted from a plurality of user apparatus and a user contents control unit configured to control recording of the data received by the receiving unit into a recording area corresponding to each user apparatus with a user ID.

In considering (A), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Barraclough shows that a server is used to store photos uploaded from a users digital capturing device (camera or camcorder) (see column 2, lines 39-44). The cited portion shows that the server disclosed by Barraclough can accept data from a plurality of devices. Further, column 3, line 66 – column 4, line 11, shows a photo developing business scenario, which implies that multiple users (i.e. customers) may upload their digital data to the server. The parsing done using the server implies a recording area corresponding to each user apparatus, (i.e. in order to keep the customer photos separate for privacy and copyright issues). Although the parsing performed by the server also implies a user ID attached to the sets of photos uploaded to the server (so the correct images are sent to the recipients), the Examiner has introduced Bandaru to show that it would have been obvious to have separate profiles with a unique account to organize shared contents (see column 16, lines 1-13 and column 15, lines 37-57). The Examiner has also relied on Bandaru to show that it would have been an obvious modification to include a shared data flag in order to improve upon Barraclough's shared contents control unit by allowing a user to individually select which images to keep private or share with friends.

KRISNA LIM
PRIMARY EXAMINER